

(12) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization International Bureau



(43) International Publication Date
11 November 2004 (11.11.2004)

PCT

(10) International Publication Number
WO 2004/098148 A1

(51) International Patent Classification⁷: H04L 29/06, 12/58

(74) Agents: AYERS, Martyn, L., S. et al.; J.A. Kemp & Co., 14 South Square, Gray's Inn, London WC1R 5JJ (GB).

(21) International Application Number: PCT/GB2004/000990

(22) International Filing Date: 8 March 2004 (08.03.2004)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data: 0309465.3 25 April 2003 (25.04.2003) GB

(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US): MES-SAGELABS LIMITED [GB/GB]; 1270 Lansdowne Court, Gloucester Business Park, Gloucester GL3 4AB (GB).

(72) Inventor; and


(75) Inventor/Applicant (for US only): SHIPP, Alexander [GB/GB]; Star Internet, Brighouse Court, Barnwood, Gloucester GL4 3RT (GB).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NI, NO, NZ, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH, GM, KE, LS, MW, MZ, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ, TM), European (AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HU, IE, IT, LU, MC, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ, GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

[Continued on next page]

(54) Title: A METHOD OF, AND SYSTEM FOR DETECTING MASS MAILING COMPUTER VIRUSES



(57) Abstract: A system for anti-virus processing an email (101) having an executable attachment extracts (105) structural elements of the email and examines (106) the executable attachments for code, data or encoded data that could have created these elements. This is effective to detect at least some mass mailing viruses where the executable attachment creates later generations of the attachment and structural elements such as strings which appear in the later emails are present in the attachment.

WO 2004/098148 A1



Published:

— *with international search report*

For two-letter codes and other abbreviations, refer to the "Guidance Notes on Codes and Abbreviations" appearing at the beginning of each regular issue of the PCT Gazette.

A METHOD OF, AND SYSTEM FOR DETECTING MASS MAILING COMPUTER VIRUSES

The present invention relates to a method of, and system for, detecting mass mailing viruses.

5 The internet and local- and wide-area networks are susceptible to the exploits of mass mailing viruses. Typically, these viruses involve an email with an executable attachment which, when it executes, causes more virus-containing emails to be created and sent, flooding the network with traffic and its email users with unwanted emails.

10 These mass mailing viruses have become increasingly sophisticated: early forms of them chose the addressees from the name and address book associated with the recipient's email client, while more recent forms use a variety of techniques to gather addresses.

15 As the number of mass mailing viruses has grown, the authors of anti-virus scanning systems have had to enhance their systems to try and keep up with the threat. One tried and tested technique for detecting viruses is "signature scanning", where a file, an executable attachment in the case of email, is scanned for signatures, i.e. sequences, or patterns of sequences, of bytes which have been identified as characteristic of particular viruses. However, signature-based scanning is not particularly effective for dealing with 20 mass mailing viruses, because the time taken for the virus to do its work and cause copies of itself to be sent is small compared with the time it takes for anti-virus software houses to disseminate updates to their system to deal with it when an outbreak of a new virus occurs. This is particularly a problem where the anti-virus service is being operated on behalf of a 25 large number of users, as may be the case where an ISP (Internet Service Provider) carries out anti-virus scanning, of email and other files in transit, on behalf of customers as a value-added service.

30 The present invention is based upon an appreciation of the fact that concentrating on executable attachments overlooks a fertile source of viral-indicating information, namely the email itself and operates by carefully considering the whole email, rather than just the attachments.

According to the present invention, there is provided a method of anti-virus processing an email having one or more executable attachments comprising the steps, executed by a machine, of:

- a) extracting structural elements from the email;

b) examining the executable attachments for code, data or encoded data that could have created the structural elements extracted earlier; and

c) examining signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining step b) finds evidence that the structural elements have been created.

5 The invention also provides a system for anti-virus processing an email having an executable attachment comprising the following means, implemented by a machine:

a) means for extracting structural elements from the email;

10 b) means for examining the executable attachments for code, data or encoded data that could have created the structural elements extracted earlier; and

c) means for signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining step b) finds evidence that the structural elements have been created by that attachment.

15 The invention will be further described by way of non-limitative example with reference to the accompanying drawing in which:

Figure 1 illustrates one embodiment of system according to the present invention.

The system 100 operates on emails arriving at an input 101 and processes 20 each one to signal either at an output 102 that the system regards that email as non-viral or at an output 103 that the system regards it as viral or possibly viral. The system may be operated as a stand-alone system, or as part of a larger anti virus system either as the module with responsibility for processing e-mails or in conjunction with additional sub-systems which apply additional virus-detection heuristics to emails which it has signalled 25 as possibly viral.

Most prior virus scanners scan email by taking the email, extracting the attachments, and then scanning them for malware. The system 100, on the other hand, operates on the basis that by carefully considering the email as a whole, rather than just the attachments, it is possible to greatly increase the chances of detecting mass mailing 30 viruses.

Each email client creates emails in its own unique way, producing what one might term an email 'fingerprint' which is discernible in emails created by it. By examining the structure of emails it is possible with some certainty to say, for instance, that a particular email was created by Microsoft Outlook, or Lotus Notes, or Eudora. Mass

5 mailing viruses are also one form of email client, since they generate emails, and they will create emails with a particular fingerprint. By carefully examining the executable attachment and comparing it with the fingerprint of the email it is contained in, it is possible to say with some certainty whether the attachment generated the actual email, and this is a very good sign that the attachment is a mass mailing virus.

The system 100 operates according to the following algorithm:

10 1) A 'gatherer' 104 takes the email from input 101, and creates fingerprint information about the email structure.

2) An 'extractor' 105 extracts the next attachment from the email. If there are no more attachments left, processing stops.

15 3) An 'analyser/matcher' 106 analyses the attachment to see if it is likely that the attachment created the email by comparing with the fingerprint information. If it is not likely that the attachment created the email, return to step 2.

4) An 'exception checker' 107 checks for known exceptions. If an exception list match is found, return to step 2.

15 5) The email is flagged at output 103 as possibly containing a mass mailing virus.

The gatherer 104 parses the email, searching for structural information. For example, this could include (but is not limited to) the following:

20

- Standard Mime headers created
- Unusual Mime headers created
- Deviations from RFC standards (for example, missing out the final MIME boundary)
- Unusual construct which are legal according to the RFC standards, but which are not generally used by mainstream email clients – eg unusual capitalisation of MIME headers; comment fields used in certain MIME headers where they are not normally used; nested comment fields
- Number of attachments
- Type of attachments
- Encoding method used for attachments
- Text content of the email
- HTML/XHTML content of the email

25

30

5 A simple implementation of the extractor 105 parses the email, presenting attachments in turn to the analyser/matcher 106. This can be improved by recursively analysing compound attachments. For instance, if the attachment is an archive such as a ZIP file, it will extract each file, presenting these in turn to the analyser/matcher 106. If these files are also archives, these will also be extracted in turn and so on until no more extraction can be done. Files packed using packers such as UPX or ASPack can be unpacked. Self-extracting executables can have the files they contain extracted.

10 The extractor 105 can also have extra logic to detect situations where a malicious attacker tries to attack the system by sending files that extract to extremely large sizes, or that take a very long time to extract.

15 The analyser/matcher 105 analyses the file to try and determine whether it contains code that creates emails matching the fingerprint created by the gatherer. Each match-type is assigned a certain score. For instance, a match of a particular deviation from an RFC standard may score X, and a match of the text content of the email may score Y.

20 Scores are added together and if they pass a set value, this is deemed a match.

25 The analyser/matcher 106 can be incredibly simple. For instance, an analyser that merely extracts strings from a file using the standard linux 'strings' command (which returns the strings of printable characters in a file), and matches these against the text content of the email, is sufficient to detect most mass mailing viruses currently in existence.

30 Of course, the more complex the analyser/matcher 106 is, the better the detection rate will be. For instance, cryptographic routines can be added to detect encoded email text, as used by the W32/Klez.H virus. Code analysing routines can be added to search for email specific routines, and work out how any email is created, and so on.

35 The exception checker 107 contains rules to filter out false positives that have occurred in the past. For instance, if someone uses the Eudora email client to mail a copy of Eudora to a friend, the fingerprints will match the attachment causing the email to be treated as viral. This can be overcome by for instance, creating an MD5 checksum of the attachment, and comparing to a list of known MD5 checksums for standard mail clients; the exception checker can then recognise these known email clients and ignore them. MD5 is an example of a checksum or hashing method sensitive enough to detect whether even a single bit in the data from which the checksum is derived has been changed.

As noted above, the system 100 can be used as a stand-alone virus detection algorithm, or combined with others implementing other virus-detection techniques as part of a larger system. For instance, files flagged as mass mailing viruses by this method may be allocated a certain score, or variety of scores depending which tests pass and fail. File 5 which score some matches, but not enough for the matcher to flag as a mass mailing virus may be assigned a lower score.

These are then combined with scores from other heuristic techniques, and only if the total score passes some limit is the file flagged as viral.

Code analysis can also be used by the analyser/matcher 106. For instance, 10 the MIME headers in a mail will be present in a certain order, and if it can be ascertained by code analysis that the attachment creates emails with the MIME headers in that exact order, then this is a very good sign that the attachment created the email. A simple implementation can be achieved by finding references in the code to the data areas used to construct the email, and then noting the order in which these references occur.

15 Virus writers often encode parts of the data area of their programs in order to try and hide what they are doing. Attempts can be made in various ways to match parts of the email to data which is encrypted in the attachment. For instance, if the email contains the text:

we seem to sew

20 this might be encoded as

er drrz yp dre

First we number the string

12345678901234

we seem to sew

25 Then we note that the letter 'w' in the original occurs in the 1st and 14th positions in the original. We also note the letter 'e' in the potential encoded string also occurs in the 1st and 14th positions, and in no other position.

30 Next we note that the letter 'e' in the original occurs in the 2nd, 5th, 6th and 13th position in the original. We also note the letter 'r' in the potential encoded string also occurs in the 2nd, 5th, 6th and 13th positions, and in no other position.

Thus, the potential encoded string so far seems to be the same as the original string, but with the letter 'e' replacing the letter 'w' and letter 'r' replacing the letter 'e'. If we can repeat this test successfully for each different character in the original string, then it is highly likely that the second string really is an encoded version of the original string.

-6-

The analyser/matcher 106 may be arranged to execute algorithms such as the one just described in order to find evidence that the attachment could have created structural elements of the email.

CLAIMS

1. A method of anti-virus processing an email having an executable attachment comprising the steps, executed by a machine, of:

a) extracting structural elements from the email;

5 b) examining the executable attachments for code, data or encoded data that could have created the structural elements extracted earlier; and

c) signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining step b) finds evidence that the structural elements have been created by that attachment.

10 2. A method according to claim 1, wherein the structural elements are categorised and the step c) includes assigning a numeric score for each element which could have been created by that attachment, and signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of an overall score.

15 3. A method according to claim 2, wherein the scores are weighted according to category.

4. A method according to any one of the preceding claims, wherein the signalling step c) takes account of factors including any or all of the following attributes of the email:

standard MIME headers;

20 unusual MIME headers;

deviations from RFC standards;

unusual constructs;

number of attachments;

type of attachments;

25 encoding method used for attachments;

text content of the email; and

HTML or XHTML content of the email.

5. A method according to any one of claims 1 to 4 wherein the step a) includes extracting the structural elements as strings, the step b) includes examining the attachments

for matches of those strings and the step c) signals the attachment as possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining step b) finds occurrences of the strings in the attachment.

6. A system for anti-virus processing an email having an executable attachment comprising the following means, implemented by a machine:

- 5 a) means for extracting structural elements from the email;
- b) means for examining the executable attachments for code, data or encoded data that could have created the structural elements extracted earlier; and
- c) means for signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining step b) finds evidence that the structural elements have been created by that attachment.

10 7. A system according to claim 6, wherein the structural elements are categorised and the means c) includes means for assigning a numeric score for each element which could have been created by that attachment, and signalling that the attachment is possibly viral or not on the basis of an overall score.

15 8. A system according to claim 7, wherein the scores are weighted according to category.

9. A system according to any one of claims 6 to 8, wherein the signalling step c) takes account of factors including any or all of the following attributes of the email:

- 20 standard MIME headers;
- unusual MIME headers;
- deviations from RFC standards;
- unusual constructs;
- number of attachments;
- 25 type of attachments;
- encoding method used for attachments;
- text content of the email; and
- HTML or XHTML content of the email.

10. A system according to any one of claims 6 to 9 wherein the means a) includes extracting the structural elements as strings, the means b) includes examining the attachments for matches of those strings and the means c) signals the attachment as possibly viral or not on the basis of the extent to which the examining means b) finds occurrences of the strings in the attachment.

5

1/1




Fig.1

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Int'l Application No
PCT/EP2004/000990

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
IPC 7 H04L29/06 H04L12/58

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
IPC 7 H04L G06F

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	US 2003/079142 A1 (GRUPER SHIMON ET AL) 24 April 2003 (2003-04-24) paragraph '0003! - paragraph '0060!; figures 3-6C	1-10
A	US 2002/199120 A1 (SCHMIDT JEFFREY A) 26 December 2002 (2002-12-26) paragraph '0005! - paragraph '0037!; figures 4A-6	1-10
A	EP 1 280 039 A (NETWORKS ASSOCIATES TECHNOLOGY) 29 January 2003 (2003-01-29) paragraph '0003! - paragraph '0024!; figures 3,4	1-10 -/-

Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

Patent family members are listed in annex.

* Special categories of cited documents:

- *A* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- *E* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- *L* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- *O* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- *P* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

T later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

X document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

Y document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art.

& document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

Date of mailing of the international search report

9 July 2004

23/07/2004

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax. (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Günther, S

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

In - nai Application No
PCT/GB2004/000990

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	<p>WO 02/19069 A (HOCKEY ALYN ;CONTENT TECHNOLOGIES LTD (GB)) 7 March 2002 (2002-03-07) page 2, line 24 -page 10, line 25; figures 2,3 ---</p>	1-10
A	<p>"Postfix Configuration - UCE Controls" INTERNET CITATION, 'Online! 13 April 2003 (2003-04-13), pages 1-12, XP002287121 Retrieved from the Internet: <URL:http://web.archive.org/web/20030413192015/http://www.postfix.org/uce.html> 'retrieved on 2004-07-05! the whole document -----</p>	1-10

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Int'l	onal Application No
PCT	GB2004/000990

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)		Publication date
US 2003079142	A1	24-04-2003	NONE		
US 2002199120	A1	26-12-2002	NONE		
EP 1280039	A	29-01-2003	US 2003023875 A1		30-01-2003
			EP 1280039 A2		29-01-2003
WO 0219069	A	07-03-2002	GB 2366706 A		13-03-2002
			AU 8235901 A		13-03-2002
			EP 1368719 A2		10-12-2003
			WO 0219069 A2		07-03-2002
			US 2004064515 A1		01-04-2004